



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,560	02/05/2004	Patricia Lewis	MOR3334P2090US	5508
32116	7590	01/13/2006	EXAMINER	
WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ, CLARK & MORTIMER 500 W. MADISON STREET SUITE 3800 CHICAGO, IL 60661			CHIN SHUE, ALVIN C	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	3634

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/772,560	LEWIS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Alvin C. Chin-Shue	3634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Fong or Schweer. Fong shows arm loops 23, a drag grip 20 and a common juncture at 22. Schweer in fig. 7A shows the claimed harness. To make (cut) their arm loops and drag grips from a single length of strapping, would have been an obvious mechanical expedient.

Claims 1,2 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guynn. Guynn shows arm loops 3,B and 2,A, and a drag grip 10. To make (cut) their arm loops and drag grips from a single length of strapping, would have been an obvious mechanical expedient.

Claims 1,2 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoenbrun. Guynn in fig.9 shows arm loops 76, a drag grip 72. To make (cut) their arm loops and drag grips from a single length of strapping, would have been an obvious mechanical expedient.

Claim 2 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fong as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Crowe et al. Crowe et al shows a drag grip/leash comprising a fixed length loop. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Fong with a drag grip, as taught by Crowe, for dragging a user of his harness.

Claim 2 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoenbrun, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of either Martusciello or Campbell. Both Martusciello at 50 and Campbell at 14 show drag grips comprising a fixed length loop. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schoenbrun to comprise with a drag grip, as taught by either Martusciello or Campbell, for maintaining a grip of a user of his harness.

Claims 1,2 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hengstenberger in view of Schweer. Hengstenberger shows the claimed harness with the exception of the pair of shoulder loops. Schweer in fig. 7A shows a pair of arm loops having a fixed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the harness of

Hengstenberger to comprise a pair of fixed length arm loops, as taught by Schweer, to encircle both arms of a wearer.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alvin C. Chin-Shue whose telephone number is 571-272-6828. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Chilcot can be reached on 571-272-6777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Alvin C. Chin-Shue
Examiner
Art Unit 3634